

**County of Loudoun**  
**Department of Planning**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** September 26, 2008

**TO:** Sophia Fisher, Project Manager  
Land Use Review

**FROM:** Sarah Milin, Planner  
Community Planning

**SUBJECT: ZMOD 2008-0007, Goose Creek Village North Sign Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Referral**

**BACKGROUND**

Goose Creek Retail LLC and Goose Creek Commercial LLC have submitted a Zoning Ordinance Modification (ZMOD) in order to modify the sign provisions of the Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance and establish a Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP') for the Goose Creek Village North development. Goose Creek Village (ZMAP 2003-0008) was approved in July 2005 for up to 564 residential dwellings, 164,500 square feet of retail space and 1.0 million square feet of office space. The 141-acre property is currently zoned PD-IP (Planned Development – Industrial Park), PD-OP (Planned Development – Office Park), PD-CC-CC (Planned Development- Commercial Center – Community Center), R-16 (Townhouse/Multifamily Residential) and R-24 (Multifamily Residential). The proposed CSP would regulate signage in the PD-CC-CC and PD-OP zoned portions of the property which contain approximately 98 acres.

The property is located on the west side of Belmont Ridge Road (Route 659), just north of the Dulles Greenway (Route 267) and east of the Goose Creek, and straddles both sides of Sycolin Road (Route 643). It is located within the Ashburn Community of the Suburban Policy Area and is designated for Business uses, which can be developed as either a Regional Office or a Light Industrial community (Revised General Plan, Planned Land Use Map, pg. 7-23). Based on the approved rezoning (ZMAP 2003-0008), the property is evaluated under the Regional Office policies of the Plan.

In the first referral, staff found that the proposed CSP was generally consistent with the Revised General Plan's vision for Business communities. Staff expressed concern, however, regarding the number and size of some of the freestanding and building-mounted signs and other aspects of the CSP. The Applicant has subsequently

submitted a revised CSP (dated August 22, 2008) which addresses the majority of staff's concerns. The outstanding issues that remain are outlined below.

## **OUTSTANDING ISSUES**

### **1. Size and Number of Freestanding Signs**

In the first referral, staff found that both the number and size of the proposed freestanding signs was excessive. Many of these signs appeared to be redundant given the number of building-mounted signs being proposed and that the layout of the project allows many of the retail tenants to be easily visible from the surrounding roadways. A large number of freestanding signs could also lead to visual clutter, contrary to the Plan's vision that buildings be the prominent feature of Business communities (Revised General Plan, Design Guidelines, pg. 11-14). Lastly, staff also questioned the need for the changeable tenant panels on both the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1) and Office-Freestanding Building Entrance signs (Type OF) and recommended that the height of the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1) be reduced.

The number of freestanding signs has been slightly reduced in the revised CSP. In particular, a Community Identification Entrance Sign (Sign P2b) has been removed from the southwest corner of the Sycolin Road/Belmont Ridge Road intersection. The proposed housekeeping signs have also been removed; according to the response to referral comments, information signs will be used in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance. However, the number and size of the other freestanding signs have not been substantially altered. The response to referral comments provides additional justification for these signs, stating that "a more interconnected street network results in more entrances than is customary with typical suburban style shopping centers". With the regard to the size of signs, "while permitted ground-mounted signs are lower in height in return for greater background area, the sign plan is proposing a modification of that standard justified by the high quality design and materials of the proposed signage. Additionally, the proposed height is three feet lower than the maximum height permitted for PD-CC freestanding entrance signs".

Staff remains concerned that the proposed number of freestanding signs, when considered in conjunction with their proposed size, is unwarranted in the proposed development. Staff is particularly concerned with the project entrance monument signs (Type P1), site directional signs (Type P6), retail pad site monument signs (Type T5), office-freestanding building entrance signs (Type OF), hotel/conference center entrance signs (Type HE), and the community identification entrance signs (Type P2b). Staff recommends that these signs be reexamined.

For example, the project entrance monument signs (Type P1) have been designed to be large-scale structures whose total aggregate area will be either 127 sq ft (12' high by 8'-8" wide) or 148 sq ft (12' high by 14'-8" wide). The signs are proposed to include the Goose Creek Village name and logo as well as up to five changeable panels identifying specific retail and office tenants within the project. A total of seven of these large signs

are proposed along both Belmont Ridge Road and Sycolin Road and as such will be significant features of the project.

While staff can understand the need for one such sign at the main entrance to the retail section of the project, placing this type of large sign at every vehicular entrance to the project is unnecessary and will lead to visual clutter. The approved retail center, zoned PD-CC-CC (Planned Development – Commercial Center – Community Center), is intended to serve the retail shopping needs of the surrounding communities. As such, most of its users will be familiar with the center once it has been operating for a short period of time and therefore will not need a significant number of large signs identifying specific tenants at entrances. Similarly, providing these signs at the entrance of the office sections are unnecessary given that a large number of office-freestanding entrance signs (Type OF) are proposed for individual buildings and that the building themselves will have building-mounted signage on all four sides. Given the layout that is planned for the office sections of the project, it may be more appropriate to limit the signage within this area to smaller entrance monument signs indicating the name of the development and the specific component (e.g., the Offices at Goose Creek Village) and freestanding directional signs within these sections of the project.

Additionally, as stated in the first referral, staff questions the need for the changeable tenant panels on these signs as many of the retail and office tenants will be easily visible from the surrounding roadways and the CSP proposes larger building-mounted signs than currently permitted in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff has similar concerns with the other freestanding signs that are proposed in the CSP.

***Staff recommends that the Applicant reevaluate the number and size of freestanding signs that are proposed in the CSP, in particular the project entrance monument signs (Type P1), site directional signs (Type P6), retail pad site monument signs (Type T5), office-freestanding building entrance signs (Type OF), hotel/conference center entrance signs (Type HE), and the community identification entrance signs (Type P2b). In general, such signs should be limited to the minimum necessary, serve a clear need at that location, not be distracting to drivers, and be designed to contribute to a human scale.***

## **2. Clarifications**

Per staff's request, the Applicant has added an illustrative depicting the locations of all the freestanding monument signs proposed in the CSP. However, it appears as though the proposed Community Identification Entrance Sign (Type P2) at the Belmont Ridge Road/Sycolin Road intersection is missing from this illustrative.

***Staff recommends that the Project Overview: Freestanding Monument Sign Locations map (p. 7d) accurately reflect all the signs being proposed in the CSP.***

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The proposed Goose Creek Village North Sign Plan appears to be consistent with the Revised General Plan and is generally supportable. Staff, however, remains concerned that both the number and size of the proposed freestanding signs is excessive. Staff recommends that the Applicant reevaluate these signs to ensure that they are limited to the minimum necessary and redesign them to be more human scale. Staff also recommends a minor clarification regarding the overall illustrative of the freestanding monument signs. As always, staff would be happy to meet with the Applicant to discuss these issues.

cc: Julie Pastor, AICP, Planning Director  
Cindy Keegan, AICP, Community Planning Program Manager – via e-mail

**County of Loudoun**  
**Department of Planning**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** July 10, 2008

**TO:** Sophia Fisher, Project Manager  
Land Use Review

**FROM:** Sarah Milin, Planner  
Community Planning

**SUBJECT: ZMOD 2008-0007, Goose Creek Village North Sign Plan**

**BACKGROUND**

Goose Creek Retail LLC and Goose Creek Commercial LLC have submitted a Zoning Ordinance Modification (ZMOD) in order to modify the sign provisions of the Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance and establish a Comprehensive Sign Plan for the Goose Creek Village North development. Goose Creek Village (ZMAP 2003-0008) was approved in July 2005 for up to 564 residential dwellings, 164,500 square feet of retail space and 1.0 million square feet of office space. The 141-acre property is currently zoned PD-IP (Planned Development – Industrial Park), PD-OP (Planned Development – Office Park), PD-CC-CC (Planned Development- Commercial Center – Community Center), R-16 (Townhouse/Multifamily Residential) and R-24 (Multifamily Residential). The proposed CSP would regulate signage in the PD-CC-CC and PD-OP zoned portions of the property which contain approximately 98 acres. The property is located on the west side of Belmont Ridge Road (Route 659), just north of the Dulles Greenway (Route 267) and east of the Goose Creek, and straddles both sides of Sycolin Road (Route 643).

The submitted Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP') proposes a variety of freestanding monument signs and building-mounted signs which will identify the overall development and specific tenants, provide clear directional information, and convey information such as which entrances are for service vehicles only. The CSP includes sign location maps and detailed renderings depicting the proposed size, design, and materials of the signage. It also includes a matrix comparing the proposed signage with that permitted by the Zoning Ordinance.

According to the Statement of Justification, "approval of the proposed Goose Creek Village Comprehensive Sign Plan will help ensure that the nonresidential portions of the

community will function safely and efficiently while providing important information for its residents, workers and visitors”.

### **COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

The subject property is governed under the policies of the Revised General Plan. The site is located within the Ashburn Community of the Suburban Policy Area and is designated for Business uses, which can be developed as either a Regional Office or a Light Industrial community (Revised General Plan, Planned Land Use Map, pg. 7-23). Based on the approved rezoning (ZMAP 2003-0008), the property is evaluated under the Regional Office policies of the Plan.

### **ANALYSIS**

The Revised General Plan envisions that the County will sustain a high quality built environment (Revised General Plan, Policy 1, pg. 5-5). Within Regional Office communities, the Plan further envisions that the buildings will be the prominent feature when viewed from periphery roads (Revised General Plan, Design Guidelines, pg. 11-14). Signage in these areas should exhibit a high quality of design and materials that complement but do not overwhelm the buildings themselves. The signage in conjunction with the landscaping, site layout, and architectural design of the buildings all contribute to the high visual quality that defines Business Communities in the County.

Overall, the signage proposed in the Goose Creek Village North Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP') is consistent and compatible in design due to the use of a standard logo, typography, color palette, and high-quality materials. A hierarchy of freestanding and building-mounted signage is proposed that will serve various purposes in the development. The largest signs are project entrance monument signs proposed along both Belmont Ridge Road (Route 659) and Sycolin Road that will identify the overall community, its commercial and office sections, and larger tenants. Site directional signs and freestanding directory signs are proposed to assist pedestrian and vehicular traffic to navigate throughout the development. Lastly, a variety of building-mounted signage is included to identify the larger development as well as specific buildings and tenants. Several signs not currently permitted in the Zoning Ordinance, including site directional signs, pedestrian directories, light pole banners, are included in the CSP should the Ordinance be amended to permit such signs.

***Staff finds that the proposed sign plan will contribute to and enhance Goose Creek Village's sense of place and aesthetics. It will also create an overall sense of hierarchy and coordination that will assist visitors, residents and employees to navigate throughout the development. To fully conform to Plan policies, however, staff recommends that the CSP be revised as follows:***

A-6

**1. Name of Development**

The application is inconsistent with regards to the name of the development and the CSP. In certain places, for example the title of the Statement of Justification and the application name itself, it is referred to as the "*Goose Creek Village North Comprehensive Sign Plan*". Within the body of the Statement of Justification and the CSP itself, it is referred to as the "*Goose Creek Village Comprehensive Sign Plan*".

***Staff recommends that the application be amended to consistently name the development and the CSP as either Goose Creek Village or Goose Creek Village North, whichever is most appropriate.***

**2. Administration of the CSP**

The proposed Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP') will be administered by County staff during the review and approval of sign permit applications. In addition, the CSP states that the Goose Creek Village Architectural Review Board (ARB) will review and approve any changes to the project's logo (pg. 4 of the CSP) as well as the location of signs (pgs. 7, 7b, and 7c). It may be appropriate to expand the ARB's role to also approve modifications to the proposed typography, color palette, and overall sign design. Staff also notes that it is referred to as the "Goose Creek Village Architectural Review Board" in one place and the "Goose Creek Architectural Review Board" in another.

***Staff recommends that additional information regarding the Goose Creek Village Architectural Review Board and its roles and responsibilities be added to the proposed CSP.***

**3. Signs Not Currently Permitted**

The Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP') includes provisions for several signs that are not currently permitted in the Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance, including site directional signs (Type P6), pedestrian directory signs (Type P7), light pole banners (Type P8), and housekeeping signs (Types HP1, HT1, and HT2). The CSP includes a note for these signs stating that "*Should zoning ordinance be amended, owner reserves the right to install signage as shown, including any related graphic elements as indicated*".

Providing detailed regulations for signs not currently permitted in the Zoning Ordinance is premature at this time because the County has not yet gone through a process to determine if, and under what parameters, such signs should be allowed. A sign type that does not exist at this time should not be modified. Should the Zoning Ordinance be amended in the future to allow such signs, then the Applicant could apply for a permit to construct such a sign pursuant to the approved regulations or submit a new zoning modification to exceed them.

Staff also requests confirmation that all of the other signs proposed in the CSP are allowed per the Zoning Ordinance. For example, it is staff's understanding that second floor tenant signs mounted on the façade of office buildings (Type OT2) are prohibited.

***Staff recommends that all sign types not currently permitted by the Zoning Ordinance be removed from the Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP'). Instead, a note should be added stating that any sign not specifically addressed in the CSP shall conform to existing Zoning Ordinance regulations.***

#### **4. Freestanding Signs**

A large number of freestanding signs are proposed to identify and welcome people to Goose Creek Village, give direction to specific buildings and tenants, and facilitate the movement of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. These include eleven freestanding monument signs along the periphery of the development, four on the west side of Belmont Ridge Road (Route 659) and seven on Sycolin Road, as well as numerous directional signs, directory signs, and office, hotel, and pad site entrance signs. Overall, the proposed freestanding signs appear to be uniform in design, size, and composition and are in keeping with the character of similar signs built in the County. However, staff is concerned about the overall number as well as the specific size and design of some of these signs.

##### **A. Size and Number of Signs**

The number of freestanding signs appears to be excessive and, instead of facilitating the movement of traffic and providing clear directional information, may be distracting and confusing to drivers. A large number of signs can also lead to visual clutter and be contradictory to the Plan's vision that buildings be the prominent feature of Business Communities (*Revised General Plan, Design Guidelines, pg. 11-14*). In general, signs should be limited to one per entrance and then as needed to provide directional or other information to users.

Staff is particularly concerned with the number of site directional signs (Type P6), directory signs (Type P7), and retail pad site monument signs (Type T5 and HE) being proposed. Many of these signs appear to be redundant given that the layout of the project allows many of the retail tenants to be easily visible from the surrounding roadways and the number of building-mounted signs being proposed. Staff also questions the need for the changeable tenant panels on both the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1) and Office-Freestanding Building Entrance signs (Type OF) for these reasons. The height of the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1), at 12 feet, is also unwarranted and should be reduced to be more human-scale.

In addition to the three sign location plans currently in the CSP, it would also be helpful to provide an overall illustrative depicting the freestanding monument



signs for the entire project area to ensure that the location of signs proposed along the site's periphery are coordinated.

***Staff recommends that the Applicant reevaluate the number of freestanding signs that are proposed in the CSP. In general, such signs should be limited to the minimum necessary, serve a clear need at that location, and not be distracting to drivers. Directional signs should in general be limited to identifying specific areas of the project (e.g., the Shops at Goose Creek Village) and the addresses of office buildings. Staff also recommends that the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1) be reduced in height.***

***Given that the sign location plans in the CSP are "for illustrative purposes only and are subject to change", staff also recommends that the CSP establish a maximum number of freestanding signs per sign type. This will allow the Applicant to have flexibility regarding the ultimate location of the signs while limiting the overall number of signs that can be built.***

***Lastly, staff requests that an illustrative be provided depicting the locations of all the freestanding monument signs that are proposed in this CSP.***

**B. Design of Project Feature Sign Type P3**

One of the project feature signs (Type P3) includes the words "Next Right" signaling to southbound traffic on Belmont Ridge Road of the approaching entrance to the property. The message is not necessary given that the sign itself indicates the boundary of the project. In addition, the next right after this sign does not appear to be a major entrance to the Goose Creek Village retail center and thus may be confusing to first-time visitors to the development seeking, for instance, the residential or office sections of the project.

***Staff recommends that Sign Type P3 be removed from the Comprehensive Sign Plan. Sign Type P3b, which is the same sign without the message, could be used as a replacement.***

**C. Housekeeping Signs**

The proposed CSP includes several permanent and temporary housekeeping signs (Types HT1 and HT2) that display important messages regarding traffic circulation, such as "Service Vehicles Only" and "Please Use Other Entrance Temporarily". In addition to the message itself, these signs include the Goose Creek Village logo and project name at the top. Including these other elements negates the sign's primary purpose to convey information and reduces the sign's effectiveness. The logo and project name should be removed to improve the clarity of the signage. In addition, it is not clear how many of these signs are

anticipated throughout the project given that they are not included on the sign location map nor is their purpose adequately described.

***Staff recommends that the CSP be revised to remove the Goose Creek Village logo and project name from the housekeeping signs and to limit the number of such signs.***

#### **D. Temporary Signs**

Several freestanding temporary signs are included in the CSP (Types HT1, HT2, and M1). No information has been provided regarding how long these temporary signs will be permitted.

***Staff recommends that condition(s) of approval be developed regarding the removal of temporary signs.***

#### **E. Setbacks**

The Applicant has also requested that the minimum setback for freestanding signs from road right-of-way be reduced from the Ordinance-mandated 10 feet to 5 feet. No information justifying this request has been provided, nor is it clear whether the proposed reduction will maintain adequate sight distance and not lead to traffic safety issues.

***Staff requests additional information justifying the proposed setback reductions for freestanding signs.***

### **5. Building-Mounted Signage**

The CSP establishes a hierarchy of building-mounted signage for the retail and office uses within Goose Creek Village that is based primarily on tenant size and will identify specific buildings and tenants or the services and goods they will provide. In general, the proposed building-mounted retail signs are reasonable and consistent with the signage typically associated with retail and office areas in the County. Like the freestanding signs, however, staff has some concerns with the overall number and size of building-mounted signage.

#### **A. Retail Signs**

The proposed CSP allows retail tenants to display multiple signs along their storefront, including primary signs above the main entrances, marquee signs, awnings, under canopy blade signs, and pedestrian-level signs such as sidewalk signs, storefront graphics, etc. The CSP limits the total area of the signage allowed per tenant to 360 sq ft for large retailers greater than 15,000 sq ft and the hotel, 250 sq ft for retail pad sites, and 200 sq ft for in-line retailers. Fonts and colors of these signs can vary for different users and include a corporate logo.

**Staff finds that the number, variety and size of the proposed retail building-mounted signs will create interest to pedestrians, enhance the character of the area, and help foster a human scale. Staff, however, recommends that the CSP state that although fonts and colors can vary for different retail users, signage for individual tenants should be consistent.**

**Staff also requests clarification regarding the proposed undercanopy blade signs. These signs appear to be flush against the buildings and possibly the primary retail sign for tenants on certain buildings (Type T9) whereas they appear to be supportive signs (e.g., not the primary sign) and perpendicular to the buildings on others (Type T2).**

**Staff also recommends that the CSP specify that Tenant Sidewalk Signs (Type P8) are not permanent and will be removed at the end of each business day.**

#### **B. Office Signs**

The proposed office signs include large identification signs (60 sq ft) to identify the name of the office building as well as smaller signs (40 sq ft) to identify specific tenants within a building. Each tenant would be allowed one sign per building façade, including those on both the ground floor and upper stories, that may be internally lit and include the tenant's name and/or logo. The number and size of the office building tenant signs appear to be greater than needed and may overwhelm, rather than compliment, the buildings themselves.

**Staff recommends that signage on office buildings be limited to one sign identifying the office buildings themselves as well as ground-floor commercial retailers. Should the individual tenant identification signs continue to be proposed, then staff recommends that they be smaller than 40 sq ft and limited to only the front and rear sides of buildings instead of all four façades.**

**A single color scheme for all the signage on an office building would also be consistent with the simpler type of signage anticipated in Business Communities.**

#### **6. Landscaping and Maintenance**

No information has been provided regarding the landscaping that will be provided at the base of monument signs. Staff encourages the incorporation of native species within the proposed landscaping, consistent with Plan policies (Revised General Plan, Policy 7, pg. 5-33).

**Staff recommends that appropriate landscaping be provided around the base of the ground-mounted signs that includes native plant species. Staff also**

***recommends a condition of approval that individual signs and associated landscaping materials will be maintained in good condition.***

## **7. Lighting**

The Revised General Plan promotes the use of lighting for convenience and public safety without the nuisance associated with light pollution (Revised General Plan, Policy 1, p. 5.31). The CSP includes a note for each of the freestanding signs that states "signs shall not reflect or cast glare, directly or indirectly, on public roads or adjacent properties. There shall be no glare on roadways as a result of this illumination".

***Staff finds that the proposed note limiting lighting is consistent with Plan policies. Staff also recommends a commitment that building-mounted signs will contain no exposed lighting elements. It may also be appropriate to commit to turning off or dimming some or all of the proposed lighting at certain times of night.***

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The proposed Goose Creek Village North Sign Plan appears to be consistent with the Revised General Plan and is generally supportable. Staff recommends revisions and additional information to the package including:

- Use a consistent development name throughout the Comprehensive Sign Plan (CSP);
- Add information regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Goose Creek Village Architectural Review Board;
- Remove signs that are not currently permitted by the Zoning Ordinance;
- Reduce the number and size of some of the freestanding and building-mounted signs;
- Commit to a maximum number of freestanding signs per sign type;
- Provide an illustrative depicting the locations of all freestanding monument signs;
- Remove the "next right" message from Sign Type P3 and the Goose Creek Village logo and project name from the housekeeping signs;
- Provide information justifying the proposed setback reductions for freestanding signs;
- Provide additional information and clarifications for the building-mounted signage;

- Limit signage on office buildings;
- Commit to providing consistent and complimentary landscaping around the base of freestanding signs, i.e., low-lying shrubbery and/or flowering plants;
- Commit to maintaining individual signs and associated landscaping materials in good condition; and
- Commit to the use of lighting for signs that is the least disruptive to the surrounding areas and night sky in terms of glare and appearance.

Staff would be happy to meet with the applicant to discuss these issues.

cc: Julie Pastor, AICP, Planning Director  
Cindy Keegan, AICP, Community Planning Program Manager – via e-mail

COUNTY OF LOUDOUN  
MEMORANDUM  
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT

**DATE:** October 1, 2008

**TO:** Sophia Fisher, Project Manager, Department of Planning

**FROM:** Teresa H. Miller, Planner, Zoning Administration

**CC:** Marilee Seigfried, Deputy Zoning Administrator

**CASE NUMBER AND NAME:** ZMOD-2008-0007 Goose Creek Village Comp Sign 2<sup>nd</sup> sub

**TAX/MAP PARCEL NUMBER:** /78//86/////A/ and /78//86/////D/

**MCPI:** 153-27-7697 and 153-18-6338

---

Zoning Administration has reviewed the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission for the above referenced **Zoning Modification (ZMOD)** application for conformance to the Revised 1993 Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance and has the following comments.

Project Sign Signs

1. The Overall Freestanding Monument Sign location sheet should be updated to include all freestanding sign types to show the accurate amount of freestanding signs proposed for the site. Sign types such as the P2 and P6 signs have not been included in this overall map. The number of freestanding signs still seems excessive, particularly the freestanding office entrance signs (OF).
2. Project Entrance Monument: Type P1. To provide clarification regarding the height of the proposed signs, the applicant has stated the proposed signs are three feet lower than the maximum height permitted in the PD-CC for freestanding entrance signs. The ordinance does allow signs no larger than 20 square feet to be a maximum of 15 feet; however when larger signs are proposed, the height is a maximum of 8 feet. The P-1 signs are proposed to be 12' feet in height. The height of the signs is still a concern.
3. Site Directional: Type P6. Please note that Section 5-1204(D)(7)(h) does permit on site directional signs, however they shall contain no advertising. The sign will need to be modified to remove the Goose Creek Village and logo. Directional signs may only be located where there is a change in direction. As many as three of the P6 signs are proposed for the same intersections.
4. Pedestrian Directory: Type P7. This is not a permitted sign type. Within the first submission package, this sign type was marked as "future" and staff asked that all sign type such as this be removed from the comprehensive sign plan.

COUNTY OF LOUDOUN  
MEMORANDUM  
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT

**DATE:** July 25, 2008  
**TO:** Sophia Fisher, Project Manager, Department of Planning  
**FROM:** Teresa H. Miller, Planner, Zoning Administration  
**CC:** Marilee Seigfried, Deputy Zoning Administrator  
**CASE NUMBER AND NAME:** ZMOD-2008-0007 Goose Creek Village Comp Sign  
**TAX/MAP PARCEL NUMBER:** /78//86/////A/ and /78//86/////D/  
**MCPI:** 153-27-7697 and 153-18-6338

---

Section 6-1504 permits modifications; however no modifications shall be permitted that affect uses, density or floor area ratio. As a sign is an accessory use, the sign types may not be modified. In addition, if there is not an associated sign type for a proposed sign, a modification may not be made to add the sign. Please be advised that approval of a comprehensive sign package containing signs which are either prohibited or not permitted by the zoning ordinance does not authorize zoning permit approval or issuance for such signs. Zoning Administration has reviewed the above referenced **Zoning Modification (ZMOD)** application for conformance to the Revised 1993 Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance and has the following comments.

1. Section 5-300 Visibility at Intersection. The applicant has requested a modification of the required distance from Right-of-Ways for freestanding signs from 10 feet to 5 feet. All signs shall comply with the requirements of this section regarding visibility at intersections.
2. Sign Illumination – Section 5-1202(A)(2) prohibits signs which outline any building or part thereof with neon or other permanent lights. The use of exposed bulbs or neon tubes is prohibited.

Comprehensive Sign Design

3. Staff recommends a note be added regarding any signs not included in this comprehensive sign plan shall be regulated by the Revised 1993 Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance, including any additional sign types added through a zoning ordinance amendment. The signs proposed with the note “should zoning ordinance be amended, owner reserves the right to install signage as shown, including any related graphic elements as indicated,” should be removed from the sign package as a

modification can not be granted for a sign type that does not exist at this time nor can signs which the zoning ordinance prohibits be included such as pole mounted signs. Should the ordinance be amended, the owner may install such signs within the limits of the zoning ordinance or apply for a zoning modification to exceed the zoning ordinance requirements.

4. Please address the proposed landscaping treatments of all freestanding signs.
5. Wall mounted signs may not be placed above the internal roofline of buildings. Wall mounted signs may not be located on a parapet wall.

#### Project Sign Signs

6. Project Entrance Monument: Type P1. The applicant is proposing eight P1 sign types throughout the project in addition to four other Project Feature Signs. The number of proposed project entrance signs should be reduced. In addition, the proposed height of the entrance monuments is excessive. The zoning ordinance currently allows for larger freestanding signs on monuments; however the height of the sign is reduced in exchange for an enlarged sign area. A lower profile sign would be more appropriate and in line with the zoning ordinance. The applicant will also need to include the square footage of the flying geese as this is the Goose Creek Village logo.
7. Project Feature Sign: Type P2. As this sign is located at the corner of Belmont Ridge Road and Sycolin Road, it is not located at a vehicular entrance to the commercial development. Should the applicant remove the logo/signage, the architectural element may remain.
8. Project Feature Sign: Type P2b. As this sign is located at the corner of Belmont Ridge Road and Sycolin Road, it is not located at a vehicular entrance to the commercial development. The signage will need to be removed.
9. Project Feature Sign: Type P3. This sign is not located at a vehicular entrance to the commercial center. In order for the sign to be considered an entrance sign, it will need to be moved further to the west and located at the entrance to the commercial center. In addition, the flying geese will need to be counted toward sign area. The "Next Right" portion of the sign should be removed.
10. Project Feature Sign: Type P3b. This sign is located internal to the Goose Creek Village and is not considered an entrance sign. Please remove this sign as it is not a permitted sign type.
11. Building Mounted Project Identification: Type P4. This is not a permitted sign type. Section 5-1204(D)(3)(c) PD-CC-CC Community Entrance signs are permitted to be Freestanding signs only, not building mounted.



12. Project Tower Sign: Type P5. This is not a permitted sign type. 5-1204(D)(3)(c) Section PD-CC-CC Community Entrance signs permitted to be Freestanding signs only, not building mounted.
13. Site Directional: Type P6. Please note that Section 5-1204(D)(7)(h) does permit on site directional signs, however it is possible to see all tenants located in this center from the proposed location of the directional signs. These signs would appear to be excessive and not needed.
14. Parking Garage Signs: Type P9. Address signs which contain no advertising/logos are not regulated by the zoning ordinance. Remove "Goose Creek Village" from the round parking signs. Once all advertising/logos are removed, these signs may be removed from the comprehensive sign plan.
15. Real Estate Signs: Type M1. The number of real estate signs permitted at any one time should be included with the modification request.

#### Tenant Signs

16. Large In-Line / Freestanding Anchor: Type T1. Be advised that due to the proximity of the Harris Teeter signs to each other, these signs would be permitted as one (1) sign instead of two (2) or three (3) signs. The total for the three signs would be 173.93 square foot and the two signs 121.27 square feet. This is in excess of the 110 square foot maximum for a single sign area as proposed. Adjust the graphics and matrix accordingly.
17. In-line Retail Center Signs: Type T2. Corporate colors and/or logos located on awnings will all be calculated toward the sign area. All business signs must be placed on the façade of the buildings where the commodity or service is sold and/or offered. No "off-site" signs for businesses are permitted. Building signs may not be located above the internal building roofline or on a parapet wall. Based on the elevation examples shown on Sheet 25, the proposed signs seem excessive in size and number on the building façade.
18. Gas Station Canopy Sign: Type T6. Be advised that striping/logos located on the canopy, illuminated or not, will count toward aggregate signage. In addition, any signs located on the gas pumps which are visible from the road will be counted.
19. Gas Station Sign: Federally Mandated Gasoline Price Posting Sign. While the federally mandated gasoline price posting is excluded, all other logos/signage will need to be addressed in the sign plan. In addition, this sign should be located closer to the automobile service station pad site.
20. Office Building ID Signs: Type OT1. The name and message of Office ID signs must be the same on all facades. The signs must be located at the top floor of the building. Update the matrix to reflect this requirement.

21. Office Tenant Building Signs: Type OT2. Tenant signs on office buildings are permitted only for ground floor related commercial tenants above their individual entrances. Office tenant signs are not a permitted sign type on any floor of an office building.
22. Office Related Commercial Building Signs: Type OR. Per Section 5-1204(D)(3)(p), this category is for ground floor tenants of office buildings who are not office users. This category is for related commercial users such as retail, restaurant, personal services, etc. This sign type is not for office tenants. These signs must be located over the entrance of the business it identifies. Signs may not be located on facades which do not have a tenant entrance.
23. Office-Freestanding Building Entrance Signs: Type OF. The applicant is proposing eighteen (18) office-freestanding building entrance signs, which is more than the number of office buildings for the site. The number of signs should be reduced and or combined for buildings. The signs should be located at the vehicular entrances for the office buildings. The applicant is proposing to list the tenants within each building. Section 5-1204(D)(3)(q) which regulates office directory signs requires the signs to not be visible from the outside. The tenant names should be removed from the entrance signs. The maximum size of the background structure should also be provided.
24. Hotel/Conference Center Building Signs: Type HC. The signs may not be located above the internal roofline of the building or on a parapet wall. The signs must also be located at the top floor of the building. Update the matrix to reflect this requirement.
25. Storefront Graphics (Detail). The requirements state that the window graphic signage should not cover more than fifteen percent (15%) of a shop's windows. Clarify if this is fifteen percent of each window. Provide to scale graphics which represent the maximum amount of window graphics this would allow. The address numerals may be removed as the address is not regulated by the zoning ordinance.

I, Allan D. McKelvie, Agent,, do hereby state that I am an

     Applicant

☒ Applicant's Authorized Agent listed in Section C.1. below

in Application Number(s): ZMOD 2008-0007

and that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the following information is true:

**C. DISCLOSURES: REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST AND LAND USE PROCEEDINGS**

**1. REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST**

The following constitutes a listing of the names and addresses of all **APPLICANTS, TITLE OWNERS, CONTRACT PURCHASERS** and **LESSEES** of the land described in the application\* and if any of the forgoing is a **TRUSTEE\*\*** each **BENEFICIARY** of such trust, and all **ATTORNEYS**, and **REAL ESTATE BROKERS**, and all AGENTS of any of the foregoing.

All relationships to the persons or entities listed above in **BOLD** print must be disclosed. Multiple relationships may be listed together (ex. Attorney/Agent, Contract Purchaser/Lessee, Applicant/Title Owner, etc.) For a multiple parcel application, list the Parcel Identification Number (PIN) of the parcel(s) for each owner(s).

<i><b>PIN</b></i>	<i><b>NAME</b></i> <i><b>(First, M.I., Last)</b></i>	<i><b>ADDRESS</b></i> <i><b>(Street, City, State, Zip Code)</b></i>	<i><b>RELATIONSHIP</b></i> <i><b>(Listed in bold above)</b></i>
153-18-6338	Goose Creek Retail LLC	1712 I Street, NW, Suite 305 Washington, D.C. 20006	Applicant/Title Owner
153-27-7697	Goose Creek Commercial LLC	1712 I Street, NW, Suite 305 Washington, D.C. 20006	Title Owner
	Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, PC	1 E. Market Street, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Leesburg, VA 20176	Attorneys/Planners/Agent
	Urban Engineering & Associates, Inc. t/a Urban, Ltd.	4200 D Technology Court Chantilly, VA 20151	Engineer/Agent
	Brown Craig Turner Architects	100 North Charles Street, 18 <sup>th</sup> Floor Baltimore, MD 21291	Architect/Agent

\* In the case of a condominium, the title owner, contract purchaser, or lessee of 10% or more of the units in the condominium.

\*\* In the case of a TRUSTEE, list Name of Trustee, name of Trust, if applicable, and name of each beneficiary.

Check if applicable:

☒ There are additional Real Parties in Interest. See Attachment to Paragraph C-1.

Revised October 21, 2008

**ATTACHMENT 2**

A-19

### **LISTING OF INDIVIDUAL AGENTS**

- 1. Goose Creek Retail LLC**  
Allan D. McKelvie
- 2. Goose Creek Commercial LLC**  
Allan D. McKelvie
- 3. Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, P.C.**  
J. Randall Minchew, Esq.  
William J. Keefe  
Michael G. Romeo  
Christine E. Gleckner  
Kimberlee Welsh Cummings  
Andrew A. Painter
- 4. Urban Engineering & Associates, Inc. t/a Urban Ltd.**  
Brian A. Sears  
Michael B. Keith
- 5. Brown Craig Turner Architects**  
Earl F. Sipes

If multiple copies of this page are provided please indicate Page 2 of 2 pages.

## 2. CORPORATION INFORMATION (see also Instructions, Paragraph B.3 above)

The following constitutes a listing of the **SHAREHOLDERS** of all corporations disclosed in this affidavit who own 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and where such corporation has 100 or fewer shareholders, a listing of all of the shareholders, and if such corporation is an owner of the subject land, all **OFFICERS** and **DIRECTORS** of such corporation. (Include sole proprietorships, limited liability companies and real estate investment trusts).

**Name and Address of Corporation:** (complete name, street address, city, state, zip code)

Goose Creek Retail LLC  
800 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Ste 1100, Washington, D.C. 20006

### Description of Corporation:

☒ There are 100 or fewer shareholders and all shareholders are listed below.

☐ There are more than 100 shareholders, and all shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.

☐ There are more than 100 shareholders but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.

☐ There are more than 500 shareholders and stock is traded on a national or local stock exchange.

### Names of Shareholders:

<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>
Darala Investment & Development Corporation, Managing Member	Barbara A. Brown, Member
Cynthia G. Brown, Member	Cynthia G. Brown Grantor Annuity Trust f/b/o Amelia Brown, Member
Lucy Lyle Tower, Member	Allan D. McKelvie, Member
Allan D. McKelvie Trust f/b/o Allan D. McKelvie, Darina C. McKelvie, Roderick McKelvie, Margot McKelvie, Member	McKelvie Special Trust f/b/o Allan D. McKelvie, Darina C. McKelvie, Roderick McKelvie, Margot McKelvie, Member
The William M. Burton Revocable Trust f/b/o Mike Burton and Ben Burton, Member	Brookes Avenue L.L.C., Member

### Names of Officers and Directors:

<b>NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>Title</b> <b>(e.g. President, Treasurer)</b>

Check if applicable:

☒ There is additional Corporation Information. See Attachment to Paragraph C-2.

## 2. CORPORATION INFORMATION (see also Instructions, Paragraph B.3 above)

The following constitutes a listing of the **SHAREHOLDERS** of all corporations disclosed in this affidavit who own 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and where such corporation has 100 or fewer shareholders, a listing of all of the shareholders, **and if such corporation is an owner of the subject land**, all **OFFICERS** and **DIRECTORS** of such corporation. (Include sole proprietorships, limited liability companies and real estate investment trusts).

**Name and Address of Corporation:** (complete name, street address, city, state, zip code)

Goose Creek Commercial LLC  
800 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Ste 1100, Washington, D.C. 20006

### Description of Corporation:

☒ There are 100 or fewer shareholders and all shareholders are listed below.

☐ There are more than 100 shareholders, and all shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.

☐ There are more than 100 shareholders but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.

☐ There are more than 500 shareholders and stock is traded on a national or local stock exchange.

### Names of Shareholders:

<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>
Darala Investment & Development Corporation, Managing Member	Barbara A. Brown, Member
Cynthia G. Brown, Member	Cynthia G. Brown Grantor Annuity Trust f/b/o Amelia Brown, Member
Lucy Lyle Tower, Member	Allan D. McKelvie, Member
Allan D. McKelvie Trust f/b/o Allan D. McKelvie, Darina C. McKelvie, Roderick McKelvie, Margot McKelvie, Member	McKelvie Special Trust f/b/o Allan D. McKelvie, Darina C. McKelvie, Roderick McKelvie, Margot McKelvie, Member
The William M. Burton Revocable Trust f/b/o Mike Burton and Ben Burton, Member	Brookes Avenue L.L.C., Member

### Names of Officers and Directors:

<b>NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>Title</b> <b>(e.g. President, Treasurer)</b>

Check if applicable:

☒ There is additional Corporation Information. See Attachment to Paragraph C-2.

## 2. CORPORATION INFORMATION (see also Instructions, Paragraph B.3 above)

The following constitutes a listing of the **SHAREHOLDERS** of all corporations disclosed in this affidavit who own 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and where such corporation has 100 or fewer shareholders, a listing of all of the shareholders, and if such corporation is an owner of the subject land, all **OFFICERS** and **DIRECTORS** of such corporation. (Include sole proprietorships, limited liability companies and real estate investment trusts).

**Name and Address of Corporation:** (complete name, street address, city, state, zip code)

**Darala Investment & Development Corporation**  
800 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Ste 1100, Washington, D.C. 20006

### Description of Corporation:

☒ There are 100 or fewer shareholders and all shareholders are listed below.

☐ There are more than 100 shareholders, and all shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.

☐ There are more than 100 shareholders but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.

☐ There are more than 500 shareholders and stock is traded on a national or local stock exchange.

### Names of Shareholders:

<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <i>(First, M.I., Last)</i>	<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <i>(First, M.I., Last)</i>
Allan D. McKelvie	

### Names of Officers and Directors:

<b>NAME</b> <i>(First, M.I., Last)</i>	<b>Title</b> <i>(e.g. President, Treasurer)</i>
Allan D. McKelvie, President	

Check if applicable:

☒ There is additional Corporation Information. See Attachment to Paragraph C-2.

**2. CORPORATION INFORMATION (see also Instructions, Paragraph B.3 above)**

The following constitutes a listing of the **SHAREHOLDERS** of all corporations disclosed in this affidavit who own 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and where such corporation has 100 or fewer shareholders, a listing of all of the shareholders, **and if such corporation is an owner of the subject land**, all **OFFICERS** and **DIRECTORS** of such corporation. (Include sole proprietorships, limited liability companies and real estate investment trusts).

**Name and Address of Corporation:** (complete name, street address, city, state, zip code)

**Brookes Avenue L.L.C.**  
**3 East Diamond Avenue, Gaithersburg, MD 20877**

**Description of Corporation:**

☒ *There are 100 or fewer shareholders and all shareholders are listed below.*

☐ *There are more than 100 shareholders, and all shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.*

☐ *There are more than 100 shareholders but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.*

☐ *There are more than 500 shareholders and stock is traded on a national or local stock exchange.*

**Names of Shareholders:**

<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>
Michael Wiencek, Member	Mary Wiencek, Member

**Names of Officers and Directors:**

<b>NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>Title</b> <b>(e.g. President, Treasurer)</b>

Check if applicable:

☒ *There is additional Corporation Information. See Attachment to Paragraph C-2.*



## 2. CORPORATION INFORMATION (see also Instructions, Paragraph B.3 above)

The following constitutes a listing of the **SHAREHOLDERS** of all corporations disclosed in this affidavit who own 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and where such corporation has 100 or fewer shareholders, a listing of all of the shareholders, **and if such corporation is an owner of the subject land**, all **OFFICERS** and **DIRECTORS** of such corporation. (Include sole proprietorships, limited liability companies and real estate investment trusts).

**Name and Address of Corporation:** (complete name, street address, city, state, zip code)

**Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, P.C.**  
**1 E. Market Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Leesburg, Virginia 20176**

### Description of Corporation:

☒ *There are 100 or fewer shareholders and all shareholders are listed below.*

☐ *There are more than 100 shareholders, and all shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.*

☐ *There are more than 100 shareholders but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.*

☐ *There are more than 500 shareholders and stock is traded on a national or local stock exchange.*

### Names of Shareholders:

<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>
David J. Bomgardner	E. Andrew Burcher
Thomas J. Colucci	Peter M. Dolan, Jr.
Jay du Von	Jerry K. Emrich
William A. Fogarty	John H. Foote
H. Mark Goetzman	Bryan H. Guidash
Michael D. Lubeley	J. Randall Minchew
M. Catharine Puskar	John E. Rinaldi
Lynn J. Strobel	Garth M. Wainman
Nan E. Walsh	Martin D. Walsh

### Names of Officers and Directors:

<b>NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>Title</b> <b>(e.g. President, Treasurer)</b>

Check if applicable:

☒ *There is additional Corporation Information. See Attachment to Paragraph C-2.*

## 2. CORPORATION INFORMATION (see also Instructions, Paragraph B.3 above)

The following constitutes a listing of the **SHAREHOLDERS** of all corporations disclosed in this affidavit who own 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and where such corporation has 100 or fewer shareholders, a listing of all of the shareholders, and if such corporation is an owner of the subject land, all **OFFICERS** and **DIRECTORS** of such corporation. (Include sole proprietorships, limited liability companies and real estate investment trusts).

**Name and Address of Corporation:** (complete name, street address, city, state, zip code)

Urban Engineering & Associates, Inc. t/a Urban Ltd.  
4200 D Technology Court, Chantilly, VA 20151

### Description of Corporation:

☒ There are 100 or fewer shareholders and all shareholders are listed below.

☐ There are more than 100 shareholders, and all shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.

☐ There are more than 100 shareholders but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.

☐ There are more than 500 shareholders and stock is traded on a national or local stock exchange.

### Names of Shareholders:

<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <i>(First, M.I., Last)</i>	<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <i>(First, M.I., Last)</i>
Barry B. Smith	
J. Edgar Sears, Jr.	
Brian A. Sears	

### Names of Officers and Directors:

<b>NAME</b> <i>(First, M.I., Last)</i>	<b>Title</b> <i>(e.g. President, Treasurer)</i>

Check if applicable:

☒ There is additional Corporation Information. See Attachment to Paragraph C-2.

**2. CORPORATION INFORMATION** (see also Instructions, Paragraph B.3 above)

The following constitutes a listing of the **SHAREHOLDERS** of all corporations disclosed in this affidavit who own 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and where such corporation has 100 or fewer shareholders, a listing of all of the shareholders, and if such corporation is an owner of the subject land, all **OFFICERS** and **DIRECTORS** of such corporation. (Include sole proprietorships, limited liability companies and real estate investment trusts).

**Name and Address of Corporation:** (complete name, street address, city, state, zip code)

**Brown Craig Turner Architects**  
**100 North Charles Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor, Baltimore, MD 21291**

**Description of Corporation:**

☒ *There are 100 or fewer shareholders and all shareholders are listed below.*

☐ *There are more than 100 shareholders, and all shareholders owning 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation are listed below.*

☐ *There are more than 100 shareholders but no shareholder owns 10% or more of any class of stock issued by said corporation, and no shareholders are listed below.*

☐ *There are more than 500 shareholders and stock is traded on a national or local stock exchange.*

**Names of Shareholders:**

<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>SHAREHOLDER NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>
Bryce A. Turner	
Robert W. Gehrman	

**Names of Officers and Directors:**

<b>NAME</b> <b>(First, M.I., Last)</b>	<b>Title</b> <b>(e.g. President, Treasurer)</b>

Check if applicable:

☐ There is additional Corporation Information. See Attachment to Paragraph C-2.

### 3. PARTNERSHIP INFORMATION

The following constitutes a listing of all of the **PARTNERS**, both **GENERAL** and **LIMITED**, in any partnership disclosed in the affidavit.

**Partnership name and address:** (complete name, street address, city, state, zip)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ (check if applicable) The above-listed partnership has no limited partners.

**Names and titles of the Partners:**

<i><b>NAME</b></i> <i><b>(First, M.I., Last)</b></i>	<i><b>Title</b></i> <i><b>(e.g. General Partner, Limited Partner, etc)</b></i>

Check if applicable:

\_\_\_ Additional Partnership information attached. See Attachment to Paragraph C-3.

#### 4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- a. One of the following options **must** be checked:

☐ In addition to the names listed in paragraphs C. 1, 2, and 3 above, the following is a listing of any and all other individuals who own in the aggregate (directly as a shareholder, partner, or beneficiary of a trust) 10% or more of the APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, or LESSEE of the land:

☒ Other than the names listed in C. 1, 2 and 3 above, no individual owns in the aggregate (directly as a shareholder, partner, or beneficiary of a trust) 10% or more of the APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, or LESSEE of the land:

Check if applicable:

☐ Additional information attached. *See Attachment to Paragraph C-4(a).*

- b. That no member of the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Board of Zoning Appeals or any member of his or her immediate household owns or has any financial interest in the subject land either individually, by ownership of stock in a corporation owning such land, or though an interest in a partnership owning such land, or as beneficiary of a trust owning such land.

**EXCEPT AS FOLLOWS: (If none, so state).**

None

Check if applicable:

☐ Additional information attached. *See Attachment to Paragraph C-4(b).*

- c. That within the twelve-month period prior to the public hearing for this application, no member of the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, Board of Zoning Appeals, or Planning Commission or any member of his immediate household, either individually, or by way of partnership in which any of them is a partner, employee, agent or attorney, or through a partner of any of them, or through a corporation (as defined in the Instructions at Paragraph B.3) in which any of them is an officer, director, employee, agent or attorney or holds 10% or more of the outstanding bonds or shares of stock of a particular class, has or has had any business or financial relationship (other than any ordinary customer or depositor relationship with a retail establishment, public utility, or bank), including receipt of any gift or donation having a value of \$100 or more, singularly or in the aggregate, with or from any of those persons or entities listed above.

**EXCEPT AS FOLLOWS: (If none, so state).**

None

Check if applicable:

☐ Additional information attached. *See Attachment to Paragraph C-4(c).*

**D. COMPLETENESS**

That the information contained in this affidavit is complete, that all partnerships, corporations (as defined in Instructions, Paragraph B.3), and trusts owning 10% or more of the APPLICANT, TITLE OWNER, CONTRACT PURCHASER, OR LESSEE of the land have been listed and broken down, and that prior to each hearing on this matter, I will reexamine this affidavit and provide any changed or supplemental information, including any gifts or business or financial relationships of the type described in Section C above, that arise or occur on or after the date of this Application.

WITNESS the following signature:



check one: ☐ Applicant or ☒ Applicant's Authorized Agent

Allan D. McKelvie, Agent

(Type or print first name, middle initial and last name and title of signee)

Subscribed and sworn before me this 28 day of October 2008 in  
the State/Commonwealth of \_\_\_\_\_, in the County/City of \_\_\_\_\_.

District of Columbia

  
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: \_\_\_\_\_

SANDRA HOWLAND  
NOTARY PUBLIC DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
My Commission Expires September 14, 2013



## GOOSE CREEK VILLAGE

### Statement of Justification

---

The viability of retail centers is intrinsically tied to the clarity and location of its signage. Signage, to assure that viability, must convey information in an eye catching yet appropriate way. Municipal ordinances including Section 5-1200 and 5-1204 of the Revised 1993 Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance, under which Goose Creek Village falls, seek to insure that project signage meets this objective. As stated in the ordinance, *"...the primary purpose of signage is to help people find what they need without difficulty or confusion and without adverse impact on the visual character of an area"*. Effective signage is tasteful, textually limited and appropriately sized.

Frequently signage square footage and type restrictions compete with the stated objectives of the ordinance. It is necessary, therefore, for the design professional to balance the merchandising objectives of the retailer with the needs of the consumer while addressing the restrictions of the ordinance. Often this requires the granting of exceptions to the ordinance by way of a Comprehensive Sign Plan (CSP).

In application the CSP will actually enhance the visual environment. Generally, and in the case of Goose Creek Village, the CSP will exceed square-footage allowances specified in the ordinance. Also, to improve clarity and pedestrian versus vehicular way-finding, additional signage types may be necessary.

Signage is subordinate to the architecture, landscaping and natural environment of the center. While acknowledging this imperative the CSP enhances the signage ordinance. It does this by effectively combining the textual and graphic necessities of project viability into an appealing, integrated and stimulating visual environment. Successfully combining these sometimes disparate elements fosters a project synergy where the total of the visual environment is greater than the sum of the parts.



**WALSH COLUCCI  
LUBELEY EMRICH  
& WALSH PC**

Christine Gleckner, AICP  
Land Use Planner  
(571) 209-5776  
cgleckner@ldn.thelandlawyers.com

October 14, 2008

**Via First Class Mail**

Sophia S. Fisher, Planner  
Loudoun County Department of Planning  
1 Harrison Street, SE, Third Floor  
Leesburg, VA 20177-7000

Re: ZMOD 2008-0007, Goose Creek Village North Sign Plan

Dear Ms. Fisher:

This letter addresses and provides you with a written response to the referral agency comments in the above referenced application. For your convenience, each of the staff comments are stated below and the Applicant's responses follow in bold italics.

**LOUDOUN COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING-COMMUNITY PLANNING  
(SARAH MILIN, 9/26/2008)**

**OUTSTANDING ISSUES**

**1. Size and Number of Freestanding Signs**

In the first referral, staff found that both the number and size of the proposed freestanding signs was excessive. Many of these signs appeared to be redundant given the number of building-mounted signs being proposed and that the layout of the project allows many of the retail tenants to be easily visible from the surrounding roadways. A large number of freestanding signs could also lead to visual clutter, contrary to the Plan's vision that buildings be the prominent feature of Business communities (*Revised General Plan, Design Guidelines, pg. 11-14*). Lastly, staff also questioned the need for the changeable tenant panels on both the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1) and Office-Freestanding Building Entrance signs (Type OF) and recommended that the height of the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1) be reduced.

The number of freestanding signs has been slightly reduced in the revised CSP. In particular, a Community Identification Entrance Sign (Sign P2b) has been removed from the southwest corner of the Sycolin Road/Belmont Ridge Road intersection. The proposed housekeeping signs have also been removed; according to the response to referral comments, information signs will be used in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance. However, the number and size of the other

PHONE 703 737 3633 ■ FAX 703 737 3632 ■ WWW.THELANDLAWYERS.COM  
1 E. MARKET STREET, THIRD FLOOR ■ LEESBURG, VA 20176-3014

ARLINGTON OFFICE 703 528 4700 ■ PRINCE WILLIAM OFFICE 703 680 4664

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ATTACHMENT 4

{L0177318.DOC / 1 2nd Referral Response 005983 000004}

A-33



freestanding signs have not been substantially altered. The response to referral comments provides additional justification for these signs, stating that “a more interconnected street network results in more entrances than is customary with typical suburban style shopping centers”. With the regard to the size of signs, “while permitted ground-mounted signs are lower in height in return for greater background area, the sign plan is proposing a modification of that standard justified by the high quality design and materials of the proposed signage. Additionally, the proposed height is three feet lower than the maximum height permitted for PD-CC freestanding entrance signs”.

Staff remains concerned that the proposed number of freestanding signs, when considered in conjunction with their proposed size, is unwarranted in the proposed development. Staff is particularly concerned with the project entrance monument signs (Type P1), site directional signs (Type P6), retail pad site monument signs (Type T5), office-freestanding building entrance signs (Type OF), hotel/conference center entrance signs (Type HE), and the community identification entrance signs (Type P2b). Staff recommends that these signs be reexamined.

For example, the project entrance monument signs (Type P1) have been designed to be large-scale structures whose total aggregate area will be either 127 sq ft (12' high by 8'-8" wide) or 148 sq ft (12' high by 14'-8" wide). The signs are proposed to include the Goose Creek Village name and logo as well as up to five changeable panels identifying specific retail and office tenants within the project. A total of seven of these large signs are proposed along both Belmont Ridge Road and Sycolin Road and as such will be significant features of the project.

While staff can understand the need for one such sign at the main entrance to the retail section of the project, placing this type of large sign at every vehicular entrance to the project is unnecessary and will lead to visual clutter. The approved retail center, zoned PD-CC-CC (Planned Development – Commercial Center – Community Center), is intended to serve the retail shopping needs of the surrounding communities. As such, most of its users will be familiar with the center once it has been operating for a short period of time and therefore will not need a significant number of large signs identifying specific tenants at entrances. Similarly, providing these signs at the entrance of the office sections are unnecessary given that a large number of office-freestanding entrance signs (Type OF) are proposed for individual buildings and that the building themselves will have building-mounted signage on all four sides. Given the layout that is planned for the office sections of the project, it may be more appropriate to limit the signage within this area to smaller entrance monument signs indicating the name of the development and the specific component (e.g., the Offices at Goose Creek Village) and freestanding directional signs within these sections of the project.

Additionally, as stated in the first referral, staff questions the need for the changeable tenant panels on these signs as many of the retail and office tenants will be easily visible from the surrounding roadways and the CSP proposes larger building-mounted signs than currently

permitted in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff has similar concerns with the other freestanding signs that are proposed in the CSP.

*Staff recommends that the Applicant reevaluate the number and size of freestanding signs that are proposed in the CSP, in particular the project entrance monument signs (Type P1), site directional signs (Type P6), retail pad site monument signs (Type T5), office-freestanding building entrance signs (Type OF), hotel/conference center entrance signs (Type HE), and the community identification entrance signs (Type P2b). In general, such signs should be limited to the minimum necessary, serve a clear need at that location, not be distracting to drivers, and be designed to contribute to a human scale.*

**Applicant Response:** *The applicant has prepared a well-thought out and well-designed sign plan using other sign plans approved by the County as a guide for preparing this sign plan. Staff stated that the signs should relate to the scale of the project. This comprehensive sign plan is for an approximately twenty-acre retail center and eighty-acre office park, with nearly 200,000 square feet approved in the PD-CC-CC district and 1,000,000 square feet in the PD-OP district. The size and scale coupled with the interconnected street and driveway network warrants substantial signage provided the signage is well-designed and well-coordinated, which is demonstrated by the sign plan. Staff comments primarily concerned the freestanding signs, which are addressed as follows:*

**Type P1/ Project entrance monument:** *Three entrance monument signs are proposed for the PD-CC-CC district – two along Sycolin Road and one at the right-in only entrance on Belmont Ridge Road. Four entrance monument signs are proposed for the PD-OP district – all along Sycolin Road. The design of both the retail center and office park provides a dispersed driveway network rather than funneling traffic to single large entrance areas as is more typical of suburban shopping centers and office parks. The entrance signage alerts drivers to the location of the various entrances into the three activity areas in Goose Creek Village. The design intent along Sycolin Road is to calm the traffic between Belmont Ridge Road and the Greenway to promote pedestrian usage, and the proposed signage is one of the streetscape elements that contribute to the urban design that alerts drivers to slow their speed through this area.*

**Type P2b/Community identification signs:** *Two of this sign type is proposed – one in the PD-CC-CC district and one in the PD-OP district located at the Belmont Ridge Road/Hay Road intersection and one at the western entrance to the community on Sycolin Road. These signs as the community identification sign for the entire Goose Creek Village, including the residential components as well as the commercial land bays. These signs are typical community entrance monument signs. The sculptural elements are included in the sign area, however. Sign Type P2 also is a community identification sign at the intersection of Belmont Ridge Road and Sycolin, but this sign is a wall-mounted sign attached to the retaining wall supporting the retail buildings and patio extension area.*

**Type P6/Directional signs:** *There are six directional signs in the PD-CC-CC district and three directional signs in the PD-OP district. The project logo has been removed from this sign as*

*requested by zoning staff. These signs are necessary due to the mixed-use nature of Goose Creek Village with three distinct land bays straddling both sides of Sycolin Road. The directional signage in the PD-CC-CC district are placed inside the retail center upon entering the center at one of the three primary entrance locations. Within the PD-OP district, the signs are placed at the primary intersection of the internal roadways within the office land bay. These signs serve the function of providing direction to portions of the Goose Creek Village that are not visible at these locations (i.e., in other land bays) but are accessed via the internal roadways where the signs are placed. These signs provide a vital function to the drivers and are not excessive given the lay-out and scale of the center.*

**Type P5/Pad site monument signs:** *Three retail pad site monument signs are proposed in the PD-CC-CC district, one for each retail pad building. Two are proposed in the PD-OP district, one for the civic use building which may not have any building-mounted signage (i.e., a church) and one commercial building in the vicinity of the hotel. With one per building, the number of signs is not excessive. The function they serve is to provide the consistent design theme through the signage for these free-standing buildings, since the building-mounted signage likely will use corporate logos and colors.*

**Type OF/Office building entrance signs:** *The proposed number of signs does not modify the number as permitted in the zoning ordinance, which is one sign per building vehicular entrance. These signs alert drivers to the vehicular entrances serving each building as well as provide a consistent design theme throughout the office park portion of Goose Creek Village.*

**Type HE/Hotel entrance sign:** *One free-standing sign is proposed using a consistent design theme with the other signage in Goose Creek Village that serves to tie the various uses together visually as well as alerting drivers to the entrance of a major facility within Goose Creek Village.*

## **2. Clarifications**

Per staff's request, the Applicant has added an illustrative depicting the locations of all the freestanding monument signs proposed in the CSP. However, it appears as though the proposed Community Identification Entrance Sign (Type P2) at the Belmont Ridge Road/Sycolin Road intersection is missing from this illustrative.

*Staff recommends that the Project Overview: Freestanding Monument Sign Locations map (p. 7d) accurately reflect all the signs being proposed in the CSP.*

**Applicant Response:** *The first referral requested that we provide a separate map of the free-standing, monument (ground-mounted) signs, which we provided. However, it now appears that what was intended a map of all of the free-standing signs – both ground-mounted and pole-mounted. A revised overview map is attached to these comments showing all free-standing signs – both ground-mounted and pole-mounted.*

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The proposed Goose Creek Village North Sign Plan appears to be consistent with the Revised General Plan and is generally supportable. Staff, however, remains concerned that both the number and size of the proposed freestanding signs is excessive. Staff recommends that the Applicant reevaluate these signs to ensure that they are limited to the minimum necessary and redesign them to be more human scale. Staff also recommends a minor clarification regarding the overall illustrative of the freestanding monument signs.

***Applicant Response:*** *The applicant has evaluated the proposed sign plan in the context of other sign plans approved by the County and believes that the proposed number and size of signs is appropriate to the size and scale of the commercial development the sign plan addresses.*

**LOUDOUN COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING & DEVELOPMENT – ZONING ADMINISTRATION (TERESA MILLER, 10/1/2008)**

**Project Sign Signs**

1. The Overall Freestanding Monument Sign location sheet should be updated to include all freestanding sign types to show the accurate amount of freestanding signs proposed for the site. Sign types such as the P2 and P6 signs have not been included in this overall map. The number of freestanding signs still seems excessive, particularly the freestanding office entrance signs (OF).

***Applicant Response:*** *The Overall Freestanding Monument Sign location sheet has been updated as requested to the Overall Freestanding Sign location sheet, which includes both ground-mounted and pole-mounted signs. The original request for this map specified monument signs only. With regard to the number of freestanding office building entrance signs, the proposed sign plan does not modify the number of this sign type. Section 5-1204 (D) (3) (I) permits one freestanding building entrance sign per vehicular entrance. The proposed sign plan provides one sign per vehicular, with a maximum of two signs per building regardless of whether there may be more than two entrances for a building.*

2. Project Entrance Monument: Type P1. To provide clarification regarding the height of the proposed signs, the applicant has stated the proposed signs are three feet lower than the maximum height permitted in the PD-CC for freestanding entrance signs. The ordinance does allow signs no larger than 20 square feet to be a maximum of 15 feet; however when larger signs are proposed, the height is a maximum of 8 feet. The P-1 signs are proposed to be 12' feet in height. The height of the signs is still a concern.

***Applicant Response:*** *The applicant acknowledges that the height of the proposed monument sign Type P1 is a modification of the maximum eight-foot height for ground-mounted signs. We were merely pointing out that the maximum proposed modified height is less than the maximum height permitted in the zoning ordinance for pole-mounted signs. The applicant is proposing an alternative design for sign type P1 than the design permitted by the zoning ordinance, which is the point of undertaking the comprehensive sign plan process. Sign type P1 is a well-designed and*

*well-proportioned sign made of quality materials that complements the balance of the signs included in the comprehensive sign plan. The architectural firm has designed a sign package with a distinctive design that is intended to enhance the signature architectural design the Goose Creek Village retail center and office park is anticipating.*

3. Site Directional: Type P6. Please note that Section 5-1204(D)(7)(h) does permit on site directional signs, however they shall contain no advertising. The sign will need to be modified to remove the Goose Creek Village and logo. Directional signs may only be located where there is a change in direction. As many as three of the P6 signs are proposed for the same intersections.

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type P6 has been modified to remove the logo as requested by staff. There are intersections where up to three directional signs are shown. However, each sign provides directions to vehicles arriving at the intersection from different directions, and, therefore, all three signs are needed to provide directions.*

4. Pedestrian Directory: Type P7. This is not a permitted sign type. Within the first submission package, this sign type was marked as "future" and staff asked that all sign type such as this be removed from the comprehensive sign plan.

**Applicant Response:** *The applicant has retained this sign type in the sign plan, because the applicant is emphasizing the pedestrian nature of the retail center and the need for such a sign type. By keeping this sign in the sign plan, the applicant is alerting the Planning Commission and Board of the need for this type signage to promote pedestrian usage of the retail center. The applicant understands that sign permits will not be issued for signs that are not permitted, even if such a sign is included in an approved comprehensive sign package.*

Very truly yours,

WALSH, COLUCCI, LUBELEY, EMRICH &  
WALSH, P.C.

Christine Gleckner, AICP  
Land Use Planner

Enclosure

cc:



WALSH COLUCCI  
LUBELEY EMRICH  
& WALSH PC



Christine Gleckner, AICP  
Land Use Planner  
(571) 209-5776  
cgleckner@ldn.thelandlawyers.com

August 25, 2008

**Via Hand Delivery**

Sophia Fisher, Project Manager  
Loudoun County Department of Planning  
1 Harrison Street, S.E., 3rd Floor  
Leesburg, Virginia 20177

Re: Goose Creek Village Comprehensive Sign Plan  
ZMOD-2008-0007

Dear Ms. Fisher:

This letter addresses and provides you with a written response to the referral agency comments in the above referenced application. For your convenience, each of the staff comments are stated below and the Applicant's responses follow in bold italics.

**LOUDOUN COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING & DEVELOPMENT – ZONING  
ADMINISTRATION (TERESA MILLER, 7/25/2008)**

Zoning Administration has reviewed the above referenced **Zoning Modification (ZMOD)** application for conformance to the Revised 1993 Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance and has the following comments.

1. Section 5-300 Visibility at Intersection. The applicant has requested a modification of the required distance from Right-of-Ways for freestanding signs from 10 feet to 5 feet. All signs shall comply with the requirements of this section regarding visibility at intersections.

***Applicant Response: The applicant has revised the sign plan for freestanding signs to meet the 10-foot setback from rights-of-way requirement.***

2. Sign Illumination – Section 5-1202(A)(2) prohibits signs which outline any building or part thereof with neon or other permanent lights. The use of exposed bulbs or neon tubes is prohibited.

PHONE 703 737 3633 ■ FAX 703 737 3632 ■ WWW.THELANDLAWYERS.COM  
1 E. MARKET STREET, THIRD FLOOR ■ LEESBURG, VA 20176-3014

ARLINGTON OFFICE 703 528 4700 ■ PRINCE WILLIAM OFFICE 703 680 4664

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

A-39

**Applicant Response:** *The applicant acknowledges this requirement. A General Provisions page (note 3 on page 2b) has been added to the sign plan, which also acknowledges this requirement.*

#### Comprehensive Sign Design

3. Staff recommends a note be added regarding any signs not included in this comprehensive sign plan shall be regulated by the Revised 1993 Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance, including any additional sign types added through a zoning ordinance amendment. The signs proposed with the note "should zoning ordinance be amended, owner reserves the right to install signage as shown, including any related graphic elements as indicated," should be removed from the sign package as a modification can not be granted for a sign type that does not exist at this time nor can signs which the zoning ordinance prohibits be included such as pole mounted signs. Should the ordinance be amended, the owner may install such signs within the limits of the zoning ordinance or apply for a zoning modification to exceed the zoning ordinance requirements.

**Applicant Response:** *The recommended note has been added to the General Provisions page (note 2 on page 2b) of the sign plan. The note referring to future amendments has been removed from the sign plan.*

4. Please address the proposed landscaping treatments of all freestanding signs.

**Applicant Response:** *Note 15 has been added to the General Provisions page (page 2b), which addresses the landscaping treatments of the ground mounted signs.*

5. Wall mounted signs may not be placed above the internal roofline of buildings.  
Wall mounted signs may not be located on a parapet wall.

**Applicant Response:** *The CSP adheres to this requirement.*

#### Project Sign Signs

6. Project Entrance Monument: Type P1. The applicant is proposing eight P1 sign types throughout the project in addition to four other Project Feature Signs. The number of proposed project entrance signs should be reduced. In addition, the proposed height of the entrance monuments is excessive. The zoning ordinance currently allows for larger freestanding signs on monuments; however the height of the sign is reduced in exchange for an enlarged sign area. A lower profile sign would be more appropriate and in line with the zoning ordinance. The applicant will also need to include the square footage of the flying geese as this is the Goose Creek Village logo.

**Applicant Response:** *The applicant now is proposing a maximum of four P-1, Option A signs in the PD-CC district, one each at the retail center entrances, and a maximum of three P-1, Option B signs, one each at the office park entrances. This community is designed with a connected street network, which means multiple entrance points, rather than the suburban single entrance style centers. With regard to the height comment, the applicant has submitted a sign plan with well-designed and proportioned, high-quality signage and materials. The purpose of preparing a sign plan is to permit deviations from ordinance standards with the demonstration of high-quality design. While permitted ground-mounted signs are lower in height in return for greater background area, the sign plan is proposing a modification of that standard justified by the high quality design and materials of the proposed signage. The proposed height is three feet lower than the maximum height permitted for PD-CC freestanding entrance signs. There are no geese included in the design for sign type P1.*

7. Project Feature Sign: Type P2. As this sign is located at the corner of Belmont Ridge Road and Sycolin Road, it is not located at a vehicular entrance to the commercial development. Should the applicant remove the logo/signage, the architectural element may remain.

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type P2 is a Goose Creek Village community entrance sign as was agreed to as a sign type at the meeting the applicant held with staff. This sign is mounted on a wall that is part of the building F patio. Therefore, only the sign lettering has been counted as well as the structural that are shown as part of the entrance feature.*

8. Project Feature Sign: Type P2b. As this sign is located at the corner of Belmont Ridge Road and Sycolin Road, it is not located at a vehicular entrance to the commercial development. The signage will need to be removed.

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type P2b has been moved to the community entrance located at Belmont Ridge Road and Hay Road extended. The sign, background structure and structural geese all have been included in the total sign area.*

9. Project Feature Sign: Type P3. This sign is not located at a vehicular entrance to the commercial center. In order for the sign to be considered an entrance sign, it will need to be moved further to the west and located at the entrance to the commercial center. In addition, the flying geese will need to be counted toward sign area. The "Next Right" portion of the sign should be removed.

**Applicant Response:** *This sign type has been removed from the sign plan.*

10. Project Feature Sign: Type P3b. This sign is located internal to the Goose Creek Village and is not considered an entrance sign. Please remove this sign as it is not a permitted sign type.

**Applicant Response:** *This sign type has been removed from the sign plan.*



11. Building Mounted Project Identification: Type P4. This is not a permitted sign type. Section 5-1204(D)(3)(c) PD-CC-CC Community Entrance signs are permitted to be Freestanding signs only, not building mounted.

**Applicant Response:** *This sign type has been removed from the sign plan.*

12. Project Tower Sign: Type P5. This is not a permitted sign type. 5-1204(D)(3)(c) Section PD-CC-CC Community Entrance signs permitted to be Freestanding signs only, not building mounted.

**Applicant Response:** *This sign type has been removed from the sign plan.*

13. Site Directional: Type P6. Please note that Section 5-1204(D)(7)(h) does permit on site directional signs, however it is possible to see all tenants located in this center from the proposed location of the directional signs. These signs would appear to be excessive and not needed.

**Applicant Response:** *Goose Creek Village is mixed-use community straddling two sides of Sycolin Road. The site directional signage has been retained at the primary internal roadway intersections to provide directions to uses in other parts of the mixed-use community (i.e., for the hotel when located on the north side of Sycolin Road and for the grocery store when located on the south side of Sycolin Road).*

14. Parking Garage Signs: Type P9. Address signs which contain no advertising/logos are not regulated by the zoning ordinance. Remove "Goose Creek Village" from the round parking signs. Once all advertising/logos are removed, these signs may be removed from the comprehensive sign plan.

**Applicant Response:** *This sign type has been removed from the sign plan.*

15. Real Estate Signs: Type M1. The number of real estate signs permitted at any one time should be included with the modification request.

**Applicant Response:** *A maximum of five real estate signs has been included in the sign plan.*

#### **Tenant Signs**

16. Large In-Line / Freestanding Anchor: Type T1. Be advised that due to the proximity of the Harris Teeter signs to each other, these signs would be permitted as one (1) sign instead of two (2) or three (3) signs. The total for the three signs would be 173.93 square foot and the two signs 121.27 square feet. This is in excess of the 110 square foot maximum for a single sign area as proposed. Adjust the graphics and matrix accordingly.

**Applicant Response:** *The measurement Sign Type T1 has been revised per staff direction and is reflected in the sign plan and sign matrix.*

17. In-line Retail Center Signs: Type T2. Corporate colors and/or logos located on awnings will all be calculated toward the sign area. All business signs must be placed on the façade of the buildings where the commodity or service is sold and/or offered. No "off-site" signs for businesses are permitted. Building signs may not be located above the internal building roofline or on a parapet wall. Based on the elevation examples shown on Sheet 25, the proposed signs seem excessive in size and number on the building façade.

**Applicant Response:** *The design of the in-line retail center tenant signs is in keeping with typical urban-style retail signage, which adds to the vibrancy of a retail district. The proposed tenant signage was modeled after the Lansdowne Town Center tenant signage, which has created a successful urban-style retail district. The business sign requirements have been added to note 11 on page 2b in the general provisions of the sign plan. Awning signage has been added to the sign plan and sign matrix.*

18. Gas Station Canopy Sign: Type T6. Be advised that striping/logos located on the canopy, illuminated or not, will count toward aggregate signage. In addition, any signs located on the gas pumps which are visible from the road will be counted.

**Applicant Response:** *The gas pump signs will not be visible from the road.*

19. Gas Station Sign: Federally Mandated Gasoline Price Posting Sign. While the federally mandated gasoline price posting is excluded, all other logos/signage will need to be addressed in the sign plan. In addition, this sign should be located closer to the automobile service station pad site.

**Applicant Response:** *While the applicant acknowledges that the federally mandated gasoline price posting sign is not regulated under the County sign ordinance, we have chosen to show it in the sign plan, since it is combined with a sign included in the sign plan. The sign is located opposite from the gas canopy where it is visible to the driving public, which is the purpose of the price sign. It is placed in front of the landscaped berm and bicycle trail, both of which limit the sign location placement options. It is set back 15 feet from the right-of-way.*

20. Office Building ID Signs: Type OT1. The name and message of Office ID signs must be the same on all facades. The signs must be located at the top floor of the building. Update the matrix to reflect this requirement.

**Applicant Response:** *The matrix has been revised as recommended.*

21. Office Tenant Building Signs: Type OT2. Tenant signs on office buildings are permitted only for ground floor related commercial tenants above their individual entrances. Office tenant signs are not a permitted sign type on any floor of an

office building.

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type O2 has been removed from the sign plan.*

22. Office Related Commercial Building Signs: Type OR. Per Section 5-1204(D)(3)(p), this category is for ground floor tenants of office buildings who are not office users. This category is for related commercial users such as retail, restaurant, personal services, etc. This sign type is not for office tenants. These signs must be located over the entrance of the business it identifies. Signs may not be located on facades which do not have a tenant entrance.

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type OR has been revised to reflect these requirements.*

23. Office-Freestanding Building Entrance Signs: Type OF. The applicant is proposing eighteen (18) office-freestanding building entrance signs, which is more than the number of office buildings for the site. The number of signs should be reduced and or combined for buildings. The signs should be located at the vehicular entrances for the office buildings. The applicant is proposing to list the tenants within each building. Section 5-1204(D)(3)(q) which regulates office directory signs requires the signs to not be visible from the outside. The tenant names should be removed from the entrance signs. The maximum size of the background structure should also be provided.

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type OF has been revised to reflect only the building name and address. The applicant is proposing one sign per vehicular entrance (with two signs maximum per building), therefore, the number of this sign type is likely to exceed the number of buildings. The number of buildings that will be constructed is unknown at this time. The background structure area has been included in the maximum sign area.*

24. Hotel/Conference Center Building Signs: Type HC. The signs may not be located above the internal roofline of the building or on a parapet wall. The signs must also be located at the top floor of the building. Update the matrix to reflect this requirement.

**Applicant Response:** *The matrix has been revised as recommended.*

25. Storefront Graphics (Detail). The requirements state that the window graphic signage should not cover more than fifteen percent (15%) of a shop's windows. Clarify if this is fifteen percent of each window. Provide to scale graphics which represent the maximum amount of window graphics this would allow. The address numerals may be removed as the address is not regulated by the zoning ordinance.

**Applicant Response:** *The address numerals have been removed from the storefront graphics detail. The sign plan and matrix have been revised to reflect that the storefront graphics will*

*comprise no more than 10% of the entire window opening area, excluding any transoms, with a maximum single graphic area of ten square feet.*

**LOUDOUN COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING – COMMUNITY PLANNING**  
**(SARAH MILIN, 7/10/2008)**

**ANALYSIS**

Overall, the signage proposed in the Goose Creek Village North Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP') is consistent and compatible in design due to the use of a standard logo, typography, color palette, and high-quality materials. A hierarchy of freestanding and building-mounted signage is proposed that will serve various purposes in the development. The largest signs are project entrance monument signs proposed along both Belmont Ridge Road (Route 659) and Sycolin Road that will identify the overall community, its commercial and office sections, and larger tenants. Site directional signs and freestanding directory signs are proposed to assist pedestrian and vehicular traffic to navigate throughout the development. Lastly, a variety of building-mounted signage is included to identify the larger development as well as specific buildings and tenants. Several signs not currently permitted in the Zoning Ordinance, including site directional signs, pedestrian directories, light pole banners, are included in the CSP should the Ordinance be amended to permit such signs.

*Staff finds that the proposed sign plan will contribute to and enhance Goose Creek Village's sense of place and aesthetics. It will also create an overall sense of hierarchy and coordination that will assist visitors, residents and employees to navigate throughout the development. To fully conform to Plan policies, however, staff recommends that the CSP be revised as follows:*

**1. Name of Development**

The application is inconsistent with regards to the name of the development and the CSP. In certain places, for example the title of the Statement of Justification and the application name itself, it is referred to as the "Goose Creek Village North Comprehensive Sign Plan". Within the body of the Statement of Justification and the CSP itself, it is referred to as the "Goose Creek Village Comprehensive Sign Plan".

*Staff recommends that the application be amended to consistently name the development and the CSP as either Goose Creek Village or Goose Creek Village North, whichever is most appropriate.*

**Applicant Response:** *The Statement of Justification has been revised to use the title "Goose Creek Village Comprehensive Sign Plan."*

**2. Administration of the CSP**

The proposed Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP') will be administered by County staff during the review and approval of sign permit applications. In addition, the CSP states that the Goose Creek Village Architectural Review Board (ARB) will review and approve any

changes to the project's logo (pg. 4 of the CSP) as well as the location of signs (pgs. 7, 7b, and 7c). It may be appropriate to expand the ARB's role to also approve modifications to the proposed typography, color palette, and overall sign design. Staff also notes that it is referred to as the "Goose Creek Village Architectural Review Board" in one place and the "Goose Creek Architectural Review Board" in another.

*Staff recommends that additional information regarding the Goose Creek Village Architectural Review Board and its roles and responsibilities be added to the proposed CSP.*

**Applicant Response:** *The role of the Goose Creek Village architectural review committee or board of directors is included in Note 18 on page 2b of the CSP.*

### **3. Signs Not Currently Permitted**

The Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP') includes provisions for several signs that are not currently permitted in the Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance, including site directional signs (Type P6), pedestrian directory signs (Type P7), light pole banners (Type P8), and housekeeping signs (Types HP1, HT1, and HT2). The CSP includes a note for these signs stating that "Should zoning ordinance be amended, owner reserves the right to install signage as shown, including any related graphic elements as indicated".

Providing detailed regulations for signs not currently permitted in the Zoning Ordinance is premature at this time because the County has not yet gone through a process to determine if, and under what parameters, such signs should be allowed. A sign type that does not exist at this time should not be modified. Should the Zoning Ordinance be amended in the future to allow such signs, then the Applicant could apply for a permit to construct such a sign pursuant to the approved regulations or submit a new zoning modification to exceed them.

Staff also requests confirmation that all of the other signs proposed in the CSP are allowed per the Zoning Ordinance. For example, it is staff's understanding that second floor tenant signs mounted on the façade of office buildings (Type OT2) are prohibited.

*Staff recommends that all sign types not currently permitted by the Zoning Ordinance be removed from the Comprehensive Sign Plan ('CSP'). Instead, a note should be added stating that any sign not specifically addressed in the CSP shall conform to existing Zoning Ordinance regulations.*

**Applicant Response:** *All sign types not currently permitted by the Zoning Ordinance have been removed from the CSP, and the recommended note has been added to the General Provisions as Note 2 on page 2b of the CSP.*

### **4. Freestanding Signs**

A large number of freestanding signs are proposed to identify and welcome people to Goose Creek Village, give direction to specific buildings and tenants, and facilitate the movement of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. These include eleven freestanding monument signs along the

periphery of the development, four on the west side of Belmont Ridge Road (Route 659) and seven on Sycolin Road, as well as numerous directional signs, directory signs, and office, hotel, and pad site entrance signs. Overall, the proposed freestanding signs appear to be uniform in design, size, and composition and are in keeping with the character of similar signs built in the County. However, staff is concerned about the overall number as well as the specific size and design of some of these signs.

**A. Size and Number of Signs**

The number of freestanding signs appears to be excessive and, instead of facilitating the movement of traffic and providing clear directional information, may be distracting and confusing to drivers. A large number of signs can also lead to visual clutter and be contradictory to the Plan's vision that buildings be the prominent feature of Business Communities (*Revised General Plan, Design Guidelines, pg. 11-14*). In general, signs should be limited to one per entrance and then as needed to provide directional or other information to users.

Staff is particularly concerned with the number of site directional signs (Type P6), directory signs (Type P7), and retail pad site monument signs (Type T5 and HE) being proposed. Many of these signs appear to be redundant given that the layout of the project allows many of the retail tenants to be easily visible from the surrounding roadways and the number of building-mounted signs being proposed. Staff also questions the need for the changeable tenant panels on both the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1) and Office-Freestanding Building Entrance signs (Type OF) for these reasons. The height of the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1), at 12 feet, is also unwarranted and should be reduced to be more human-scale.

In addition to the three sign location plans currently in the CSP, it would also be helpful to provide an overall illustrative depicting the freestanding monument signs for the entire project area to ensure that the location of signs proposed along the site's periphery are coordinated.

*Staff recommends that the Applicant reevaluate the number of freestanding signs that are proposed in the CSP. In general, such signs should be limited to the minimum necessary, serve a clear need at that location, and not be distracting to drivers. Directional signs should in general be limited to identifying specific areas of the project (e.g., the Shops at Goose Creek Village) and the addresses of office buildings. Staff also recommends that the Project Entrance Monument signs (Type P1) be reduced in height.*

**Applicant Response:** *Freestanding community and project identification signs have been limited to one sign per entrance. The applicant now is proposing a maximum of four P-1, Option A signs in the PD-CC district, one each at the retail center entrances, and a maximum of three P-1, Option B signs, one each at the office park entrances. A more interconnected street network results in more entrances than is customary with typical suburban style shopping centers. A well-designed sign plan such as the one proposed, however, provides community cohesiveness through coordinated design as well as adding to the vibrancy of a*

*more urban-style mixed-use center. Freestanding vehicular directional signs have been placed at the major intersections within the retail center and the office park. Directions are provided to uses within and between these two areas. Freestanding pedestrian directional signs have been placed at strategic locations at the major pedestrian walkways from the parking areas. These signs enhance the pedestrian experience of the retail center. In response to the comment regarding height, the applicant has submitted a sign plan with well-designed and proportioned, high-quality signage and materials. The purpose of preparing a sign plan is to permit deviations from ordinance standards with the demonstration of high-quality design. While permitted ground-mounted signs are lower in height in return for greater background area, the sign plan is proposing a modification of that standard justified by the high quality design and materials of the proposed signage. Additionally, the proposed height is three feet lower than the maximum height permitted for PD-CC freestanding entrance signs.*

*Given that the sign location plans in the CSP are "for illustrative purposes only and are subject to change", staff also recommends that the CSP establish a maximum number of freestanding signs per sign type. This will allow the Applicant to have flexibility regarding the ultimate location of the signs while limiting the overall number of signs that can be built.*

**Applicant Response:** *The CSP has been revised to establish a maximum number of freestanding signs per type, as recommended.*

*Lastly, staff requests that an illustrative be provided depicting the locations of all the freestanding monument signs that are proposed in this CSP.*

**Applicant Response:** *An additional sign location plan has been included in the CSP, which depicts the locations of the freestanding signs.*

**B. Design of Project Feature Sign Type P3**

One of the project feature signs (Type P3) includes the words "Next Right" signaling to southbound traffic on Belmont Ridge Road of the approaching entrance to the property. The message is not necessary given that the sign itself indicates the boundary of the project. In addition, the next right after this sign does not appear to be a major entrance to the Goose Creek Village retail center and thus may be confusing to first-time visitors to the development seeking, for instance, the residential or office sections of the project.

*Staff recommends that Sign Type P3 be removed from the Comprehensive Sign Plan. Sign Type P3b, which is the same sign without the message, could be used as a replacement.*

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type P3 has been removed from the CSP, and Sign Type P3b (renumbered as P2b) is being used instead, as recommended.*

**C. Housekeeping Signs**

The proposed CSP includes several permanent and temporary housekeeping signs (Types HT1 and HT2) that display important messages regarding traffic circulation, such as "Service Vehicles Only" and "Please Use Other Entrance Temporarily". In addition to the message itself, these signs include the Goose Creek Village logo and project name at the top. Including these other elements negates the sign's primary purpose to convey information and reduces the sign's effectiveness. The logo and project name should be removed to improve the clarity of the signage. In addition, it is not clear how many of these signs are anticipated throughout the project given that they are not included on the sign location map nor is their purpose adequately described.

*Staff recommends that the CSP be revised to remove the Goose Creek Village logo and project name from the housekeeping signs and to limit the number of such signs.*

**Applicant Response:** *Housekeeping signs have been removed from the sign plan. Informational signs will be used in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance.*

**D. Temporary Signs**

Several freestanding temporary signs are included in the CSP (Types HT1, HT2, and M1). No information has been provided regarding how long these temporary signs will be permitted.

*Staff recommends that condition(s) of approval be developed regarding the removal of temporary signs.*

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type M1 (real estate signs) is the only ones of these types remaining in the CSP. Zoning staff does not consider this sign a temporary sign, since sales and leasing will occur throughout the life of the project.*

**E. Setbacks**

The Applicant has also requested that the minimum setback for freestanding signs from road right-of-way be reduced from the Ordinance-mandated 10 feet to 5 feet. No information justifying this request has been provided, nor is it clear whether the proposed reduction will maintain adequate sight distance and not lead to traffic safety issues.

*Staff requests additional information justifying the proposed setback reductions for freestanding signs.*

**Applicant Response:** *The setbacks have been revised to meet the Zoning Ordinance requirement of 10 feet.*

**5. Building-Mounted Signage**

The CSP establishes a hierarchy of building-mounted signage for the retail and office uses within Goose Creek Village that is based primarily on tenant size and will identify specific buildings and tenants or the services and goods they will provide. In general, the proposed building-mounted retail signs are reasonable and consistent with the signage typically



associated with retail and office areas in the County. Like the freestanding signs, however, staff has some concerns with the overall number and size of building-mounted signage.

#### **A. Retail Signs**

The proposed CSP allows retail tenants to display multiple signs along their storefront, including primary signs above the main entrances, marquee signs, awnings, under canopy blade signs, and pedestrian-level signs such as sidewalk signs, storefront graphics, etc. The CSP limits the total area of the signage allowed per tenant to 360 sq ft for large retailers greater than 15,000 sq ft and the hotel, 250 sq ft for retail pad sites, and 200 sq ft for in-line retailers. Fonts and colors of these signs can vary for different users and include a corporate logo.

*Staff finds that the number, variety and size of the proposed retail building-mounted signs will create interest to pedestrians, enhance the character of the area, and help foster a human scale. Staff, however, recommends that the CSP state that although fonts and colors can vary for different retail users, signage for individual tenants should be consistent.*

**Applicant Response:** *The recommended language has been added to page 5 of the CSP.*

*Staff also requests clarification regarding the proposed under canopy blade signs. These signs appear to be flush against the buildings and possibly the primary retail sign for tenants on certain buildings (Type T9) whereas they appear to be supportive signs (e.g., not the primary sign) and perpendicular to the buildings on others (Type T2).*

**Applicant Response:** *The CSP has separated the blade signs, which are perpendicular to the building, and the archway signs which are mounted under the archways of buildings E, F and G. See pages 18, 19, 30 and 31 of the CSP.*

*Staff also recommends that the CSP specify that Tenant Sidewalk Signs (Type P8) are not permanent and will be removed at the end of each business day.*

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type P8 has been removed from the sign plan.*

#### **B. Office Signs**

The proposed office signs include large identification signs (60 sq ft) to identify the name of the office building as well as smaller signs (40 sq ft) to identify specific tenants within a building. Each tenant would be allowed one sign per building façade, including those on both the ground floor and upper stories, that may be internally lit and include the tenant's name and/or logo. The number and size of the office building tenant signs appear to be greater than needed and may overwhelm, rather than compliment, the buildings themselves.

*Staff recommends that signage on office buildings be limited to one sign identifying the office buildings themselves as well as ground-floor commercial retailers. Should the individual tenant identification signs continue to be proposed, then staff recommends that*

*they be smaller than 40 sq ft and limited to only the front and rear sides of buildings instead of all four façades.*

**Applicant Response:** *Tenant identification signs on office buildings (Type OT2) have been removed from the sign plan.*

*A single color scheme for all the signage on an office building would also be consistent with the simpler type of signage anticipated in Business Communities.*

**Applicant Response:** *The recommended language has been added to page 5 of the CSP.*

#### **6. Landscaping and Maintenance**

No information has been provided regarding the landscaping that will be provided at the base of monument signs. Staff encourages the incorporation of native species within the proposed landscaping, consistent with Plan policies (Revised General Plan, Policy 7, pg. 5-33).

*Staff recommends that appropriate landscaping be provided around the base of the ground-mounted signs that includes native plant species. Staff also recommends a condition of approval that individual signs and associated landscaping materials will be maintained in good condition.*

**Applicant Response:** *Note 14 of the General Provisions on page 2b of the CSP has been added to address landscaping provided around the base of ground-mounted signs.*

#### **7. Lighting**

The Revised General Plan promotes the use of lighting for convenience and public safety without the nuisance associated with light pollution (Revised General Plan, Policy 1, p. 5.31). The CSP includes a note for each of the freestanding signs that states "signs shall not reflect or cast glare, directly or indirectly, on public roads or adjacent properties. There shall be no glare on roadways as a result of this illumination".

*Staff finds that the proposed note limiting lighting is consistent with Plan policies. Staff also recommends a commitment that building-mounted signs will contain no exposed lighting elements. It may also be appropriate to commit to turning off or dimming some or all of the proposed lighting at certain times of night.*

**Applicant Response:** *Sign lighting is addressed in note 3 of the General Provisions on page 2b of the CSP.*

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The proposed Goose Creek Village North Sign Plan appears to be consistent with the Revised General Plan and is generally supportable. Staff recommends revisions and additional information to the package including:

- Use a consistent development name throughout the Comprehensive Sign Plan (CSP);

**Applicant Response:** *Goose Creek Village Comprehensive Sign Plan is being used as the name.*

- Add information regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Goose Creek Village Architectural Review Board;

**Applicant Response:** *The roles and responsibilities of the Goose Creek Village Association are set forth in note 18 of the General Provisions on page 2b of the CSP.*

- Remove signs that are not currently permitted by the Zoning Ordinance;

**Applicant Response:** *These signs have been removed from the CSP.*

- Reduce the number and size of some of the freestanding and building-mounted signs;

**Applicant Response:** *The size, location and number of the signs have been clarified in the CSP.*

- Commit to a maximum number of freestanding signs per sign type;

**Applicant Response:** *The CSP includes this commitment.*

- Provide an illustrative depicting the locations of all freestanding monument signs;

**Applicant Response:** *This illustrative is included on page 7d of the CSP.*

- Remove the “next right” message from Sign Type P3 and the Goose Creek Village logo and project name from the housekeeping signs;

**Applicant Response:** *Sign Type P3 and the housekeeping signs have been removed from the CSP.*

- Provide information justifying the proposed setback reductions for freestanding signs;

**Applicant Response:** *The setback has been revised to meet the Zoning Ordinance standard.*

- Provide additional information and clarifications for the building-mounted signage;

**Applicant Response:** *The CSP has clarified the building-mounted signage.*

- Limit signage on office buildings;

**Applicant Response:** *Office building signage has been revised as recommended.*

- Commit to providing consistent and complimentary landscaping around the base of freestanding signs, i.e., low-lying shrubbery and/or flowering plants;

**Applicant Response:** *Landscaping has been addressed in Note 14 of the General Provisions on page 2b of the CSP.*

- Commit to maintaining individual signs and associated landscaping materials in good condition; and

**Applicant Response:** *Landscaping has been addressed in Note 14 of the General Provisions on page 2b of the CSP.*

- Commit to the use of lighting for signs that is the least disruptive to the surrounding areas and night sky in terms of glare and appearance.

**Applicant Response:** *Lighting has been addressed in Note 3 of the General Provisions on page 2b of the CSP.*

With this submission, the applicant respectfully requests being scheduled for the October Planning Commission public hearing.

Very truly yours,

WALSH, COLUCCI, LUBELEY, EMRICH &  
WALSH, P.C.



Christine Gleckner, AICP  
Land Use Planner

Enclosure

cc: Allan McKelvie, Goose Creek Retail  
Earl Sipes, BCT Architects